



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,663	02/06/2004	Trevor David Cox	A36168; 072035.0138	7517
21003	7590	04/20/2007	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA 44TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10112-4498			LEE, EDMUND H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1732	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/773,663	COX ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	EDMUND H. LEE	1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/6/04, 7/30/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claim 18 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 3/26/07.
2. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-17 in the reply filed on 3/26/07 is acknowledged.
3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1,2,6,7,8,9,10,15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Howes (USPN 5558827). Howes teaches the claimed process as evidenced at col 6, Ins 1-21; col 6, In 39-col 8, In 41; and fig 4. It should be noted that the sides of the mold are adjustable because they can be cut to varying heights.
5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3,5,11,12,13,14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howes (USPN 5558827). The above teachings of Howes are incorporated hereinafter. In regard to claims 3, the use of a specific material is a mere

obvious matter of choice dependent on the desired final product and mold equipment availability, and of little patentable consequence to the claimed process since it is not a manipulative feature or step of the claimed process. Further, the claimed material is well-known in the molding art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed material in the process of Howes in order provide a durable and reliable mold. In regard to claim 5, the use of a specific material is a mere obvious matter of choice dependent on the desired final product and mold equipment availability, and of little patentable consequence to the claimed process since it is not a manipulative feature or step of the claimed process.

Further, the claimed material is well-known in the molding art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed material in the process of Howes in order provide a durable and reliable mold.

In regard to claims 11-14, the use of a specific material is a mere obvious matter of choice dependent on the desired final product and of little patentable consequence to the claimed process since it is not a manipulative feature or step of the claimed process.

Further, the claimed material is well-known in the molding art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed material in the process of Howes in order provide an aesthetically pleasing article. In regard to claim 17, Howes teaches introducing resin into an inclined mold and mold cavity (col 6, Ins 1-21; col 6, In 39-col 8, In 41; and fig 4). Howes, however, does not teach introducing the resin at the a position proximate the lowest point of the mold cavity, and venting air displaced by the resin at a position proximate the uppermost

Art Unit: 1732

point of the mold cavity. Introducing material into an inclined mold at a low point of the mold cavity in order to vent the air in the cavity through an upper point of the cavity is well-known in the molding art for its simplicity and effectiveness. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed apparatus set-up in the process of Howes in order to effectively and simply vent the mold cavity of Howes of air.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following US patents teach the state of the art: 5306535, and 5944862.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EDMUND H. LEE whose telephone number is 571.272.1204. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY FROM 9AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on 571.272.1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EDMUND H. LEE
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1732

EHL


4/8/04